1.   This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on June 15, 2009.

2.   Claims 33-55 are presented for examination.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 33-44 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because according to page 8, lines 6-23 of the specification, "accessible medium" includes non-statutory subject matter. Therefore, "A computer accessible medium" can include non-statutory subject matter that is not one of the categories of statutory invention.

6.   Claims 45-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because "A system" does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine. Only if at least one of the claimed elements of the system is a physical part of a device can the system be a machine. "A system" comprising: a

processor (i.e., software), accessible medium (i.e., non-statutory subject matter) and modules

(i.e., software) do not include at least one hardware element. Therefore, "A system" comprising

software and non-statutory subject matter is not one of the categories of statutory invention.

7.   Claims 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are

directed to non-statutory subject matter. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be

performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or

(2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or

thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively

tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform

underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. The claimed

method including steps that are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed

mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

8.   Claims 45-46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Culliss, U.S. Patent 6,539,377 (hereinafter Culliss) in view of Machiraju et al, U.S. Patent

6,243,090 (Machiraju).

9.   As per claim 45, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

        A processor (inherently comprised); and

A computer accessible medium storing program logic operative for implementing:

a suggestion module adapted to provide a question and answer in response to a request for assistance, wherein the question and answer are selected using a category associated with the request (10, 20, fig. 1; col. 5, lines 45-52);

a context/category module configured to convert a request context to the category by searching one or more stored context maps to determine whether a match between the request context and the category is present (col. 3, lines 30-35), wherein the request context comprises one or more of:

a location within a particular website or particular information source, wherein the location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the request when the request is submitted; or

information about a system from which the request is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35); and

a statistics module adapted to return to the suggestion module a most frequently asked question for the category associated with the request based on frequency information for a plurality of questions (col. 9, lines 39-47; col. 10, lines 6-30); wherein the suggestion module is further adapted to respond to the request with the question and answer selected based upon the category from the context/category module

and based on the frequency information as determined by the statistics module (col. 5,

lines 45-52; col. 7, lines 16-45).

10.   Culliss does not teach question and answer pair. Machiraju teaches providing a question

and answer pair in response to request for assistance from a computer executed application (col.

5, line 67-col. 6, line 2); returning most frequently asked question associated with the request

based on frequency information for a plurality of questions (col. 1, lines 42-53; col. 4, lines 39-

47); wherein responding to the request with the question and answer pair based on the frequency

information (col. 1, lines 42-53; 20, fig. 1).

11.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Machiraju because Machiraju's

teaching would provide ease of use for a user in Culliss's system by allowing a user to access

frequently asked questions linked with answers (col. 3, lines 47-52).

12.   As per claim 46, Culliss and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in

claim 45 above. Machiraju further teach identify a most frequently unanswered question (col. 7,

lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40).

13.   As per claim 48, Culliss and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in

claim 45 above. Although Culliss teaches to provide a plurality of question for a given category

(col. 9, lines 39-47), however, Culliss does not teach to provide plurality of frequently asked

questions. Machiraju teaches to provide plurality of frequently asked questions (15, fig. 1).

14.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Machiraju for the same reason set

forth in claim 45 above.

15.   Claims 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss,

U.S. Patent 6,539,377 (hereinafter Culliss) in view of Warthen, U.S. Patent 6,584,464

(hereinafter Warthen).

16.   As per claim 53, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed for storing

program logic operative for implementing:

        identifying a context associated with a computer executed application, the computer

executed application being configured to receive a request for assistance (col. 3, lines 45-65),

wherein the context comprises one or more of:

a location of an electronic pare within the computer executed application, wherein the location is

a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the request when the request is submitted;

or

        information about a system from which the request is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35);

        determining which of a plurality of categories is associated with the context (col. 4, lines

25-26, 50-58);

identifying a plurality of questions associated with one or more of the plurality of
categories associated with the context of the request for assistance (col. 9, lines 39-47).

17.   Although Culliss teaches identifying a plurality of questions associated with categories
associated with the context of the request (col. 9, lines 39-47), however, Culliss does not teach
identifying and displaying a plurality of most frequently asked questions. Warthen teaches a
similar invention comprising:

identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with one or more of
the plurality of categories (col. 3, lines 41-51; col. 6, lines 1-8); and

displaying the plurality of most frequently asked questions (col. 5, lines 15-25).

18.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Warthen because Warthen's
teaching of providing frequently asked questions would increase the accuracy of Culliss's system
by accounting for the user selection of the provided list of questions to further narrow the search
to provide relevant results to the user.

19.   As per claim 54, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

determining a context associated with a request for assistance, wherein the context is
based at least in part upon a web page, the web page being currently or recently accessed by a
submitter of the request for assistance (col. 3, lines 30-35);

mapping the context to a category of questions (col. 4, lines 25-26, 50-58); and

identifying a plurality of questions associated with the category (col. 9, lines 39-47).

20.   Although Culliss teaches identifying a plurality of questions associated with categories

(col. 9, lines 39-47), however, Culliss does not teach identifying and displaying a plurality of

most frequently asked questions. Warthen teaches a similar invention comprising:

Request for assistance with a website (15, fig. 1);

identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with one or more of

the plurality of categories (col. 3, lines 41-51; col. 6, lines 1-8); and

displaying the plurality of most frequently asked questions (col. 5, lines 15-25).

21.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Warthen because Warthen's

teaching of providing frequently asked questions would increase the accuracy of Culliss's system

by accounting for the user selection of the provided list of questions to further narrow the search

to provide relevant results to the user.

22.   Claims 33-37, 39-44, 51-52 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Culliss, U.S. Patent 6,539,377 (hereinafter Culliss) in view of Suzuki et al,

U.S. Patent 5,890,139 (hereinafter Suzuki) and further in view of Machiraju.

23.   As per claim 33, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed for storing

program logic operative for implementing:

receiving a question(col. 2, line 41);

in response to receiving the question, identifying an operational context for the question, wherein the operational context is associated with the question, and wherein the operational context comprises one or more of:

a location within the particular website or particular information source, wherein the location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the question when the question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35); or

information about a system from which the question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35);

in response to identifying the operational context for the question, determining a category for the question, wherein the category is determined dependent upon the identified operational context (col. 4, lines 25-26, 50-58);

retrieving a result for the question, wherein the category and the question are both used to retrieve the result (col. 5, lines 49-52; col. 9, lines 39-45);

based on the results, determining whether the question is an answered question or an unanswered question (col. 9, lines 48-53; col. 10, lines 46-50); and

if the question is an answered question:

using a natural language indexing module to normalize the question, wherein one or more superfluous words are removed from the question to determine whether another question is substantially similar to the question (col. 9, lines 39-47); and

store tracking data for the normalized answered question indicating that the question was answered (col. 7, lines 15-46).

24.   Culliss does not teach unanswered question. Suzuki teaches if the question is an
unanswered question (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 13): store tracking data for the unanswered
question indicating that the question was not answered (col. 5, lines 6-11).

25.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Suzuki because Suzuki's teaching of
unanswered question would increase the efficiency of Culliss's system by providing the answer
for unanswered question to automatically accumulated in the database (col. 3, lines 6-9).

26.   Culliss and Suzuki do not teach the question pertains to the use of a particular website or
particular information source of a content provider. Machiraju teaches receiving a question from
a computer executed application, wherein the question pertains to the use of a particular website
or particular information source of a content provider (15, fig. 1); and using a natural language
indexing module to normalize the question, wherein one or more superfluous words are removed
from the question to determine whether another question is substantially similar to the question
(col. 5, lines 33-47).

27.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju because
Machiraju's teaching of question pertaining to the use of a particular website or particular

information source of a content provider would increase the field of use of Culliss's and Suzuki's

systems by allowing the system to receive any types of questions.

28.   As per claim 34, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 33 above. Culliss further teach wherein identifying the operational context

further comprises determining whether a web page has been visited (col. 3, lines 30-35).

29.   As per claim 35, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 33 above. Culliss further teach wherein operational context further comprises

identifying a time that a web page is accessed (col. 3, lines 30-35).

30.   As per claim 36, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 33 above. Culliss further teach wherein identifying the operational context

further comprises determining a format associated with the question (col. 3, lines 45-56).

31.   As per claim 37, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 33 above. Culliss further teach wherein the format comprises input from a field

in a web page (col. 3, lines 45-56).

32.   As per claim 39, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 36 above. Machiraju further teach wherein the format comprises an electronic

chat question (col. 4, lines 44-54).

33.   As per claim 40, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. Machiraju further teach wherein identifying the operational context further comprises determining a hardware environment associated with the computer executed application (15, fig. 1).

34.   As per claim 41, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. Machiraju further teach generating a web page configured to present an answer to the question based on said result (fig. 1 and 2A).

35.   As per claim 42, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 36 above. Suzuki further teach generating an e-mail configured to present an answer to the question based on said result (col. 6, lines 20-25).

36.   As per claim 43, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. Culliss further teach wherein determining a category for the question comprises using the identified operational context to search one or more context-to-category maps (col. 4, lines 50-57).

37.   As per claim 44, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed for storing program logic operative for implementing:

        receiving at least one question into a question module (col. 2, line 41);

normalizing the at least one question, wherein the normalizing the at least one question comprises removing one or more superfluous words (col. 9, lines 39-47);

identifying at least one category associated with a context in which the at least one question was received using a context module (col. 3, lines 30-35), wherein the context comprises one or more of:

a location within the particular website or particular information source, wherein the location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the at least one question when the at least one question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35); or

information about a system from which the at least one question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35);

retrieving results for the at least one question, wherein the category and the at least one question are both used to retrieve the results (col. 5, lines 49-52; col. 9, lines 39-45);

based on the results, determining whether the at least one question comprises an answered question or an unanswered question (col. 9, lines 48-53; col. 10, lines 46-50);

if the at least one question comprises an answered question, using a knowledge module compose a detailed answer to the at least one question (col. 5, lines 45-52).

38.   Culliss does not teach unanswered question. Suzuki teaches if the at least one question comprises an unanswered question, logging the unanswered question using a tracking module (col. 5, lines 6-11), the tracking module being configured to generate a request for another answer to the unanswered question (col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 5).

39.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at eh time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Suzuki because Suzuki's teaching of
unanswered question would increase the efficiency of Culliss's system by providing the answer
for unanswered question to automatically accumulated in the database (col. 3, lines 6-9).

40.   Culliss and Suzuki do not teach a plurality of frequently asked unanswered questions.
Machiraju teaches receiving at least one question from a computer executed application, wherein
the at least one question pertains to the use of a particular website or particular information
source of a content provider(15, fig. 1); normalizing the at least one question, wherein the
normalizing the at least one question comprises removing one or more superfluous words ()col.
5, lines 33-47); if the at least one question comprises an unanswered question, identifying a
plurality of frequently asked unanswered questions (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40).

41.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at eh time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju because
Machiraju's teaching of identifying a plurality of unanswered questions would provide ease of
use for a user in their systems by providing frequently asked questions linked with answers that
are related to the unanswered questions to the user (col. 3, lines 47-52).

42.   As per claims 51, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed comprising:
        A processor (inherently comprised); and
        A computer accessible medium storing program logic operative for implementing:

A question module configured to receive at least one question (col. 2, line 41);

a context/category module configured to identify at least one category mapped to a context of the at least one question (col. 4, lines 25-26, 50-58), wherein the context of the at least one question comprises one or more of:

a location within a particular website or particular information source, wherein the location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the question when the question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35); or

information about a system from which the question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35);

a knowledge module configured to identify an answer to the at least one question, wherein the answer is generated using the at least one category (col. 9, lines 48-53; col. 10, lines 46-50);

wherein the question module is configured to return the answer in response to the question (col. 9, lines 48-53; col. 10, lines 46-50);

a statistics module configured to provide a question and answer associated with the category (col. 9, lines 39-53);

wherein for each of a plurality of requests, based on a request type of the request, the program logic is configured to select one of the question module, the suggestion module, or the authoring module to handle the request (col. 9, lines 39-47);

wherein the context/category module, knowledge module are each used by one or more of the question module in handling the requests.

43.   Culliss does not teach an authoring module configured to receive answer for unanswered question. Suzuki teaches an authoring module configured to identify an unanswered question and receive answer data for the unanswered question (col. 8, lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 4-25); and a tracking module configured to log the unanswered question (col. 5, lines 6-11), and to request another answer to the list of unanswered questions (col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 5); and wherein the tracking modules are used by the authoring module in handling the requests (col. 8, lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 4-25).

44.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Suzuki because Suzuki's teaching of receiving answer to unanswered question would increase the efficiency of Culliss's system by providing the answer for unanswered question to automatically accumulated in the database (col. 3, lines 6-9).

45.   Culliss and Suzuki do not teach question and answer pair. Machiraju teaches a similar invention comprising: question module configured to receive at least one question from a computer executed application (fig. 2B); a statistics module configured to provide a question and answer pair based on a most frequently asked question (col. 5, lines 15-25; 15, fig. 1); a suggestion module configured to provide the question and answer pair in response to a request for assistance (col. 5, lines 15-25); to identify one or more frequently asked unanswered questions (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40); and wherein the statistics module is used by the suggestion module in handling the requests (col. 5, lines 15-25).

46.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju because
Machiraju's teaching would provide ease of use for a user in Culliss's and Suzuki's systems by
allowing a user to access frequently asked questions linked with answers (col. 3, lines 47-52).

47.   As per claim 52, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as
claimed in claim 51 above. Suzuki further teach wherein the authoring module associates the
another answer with the unanswered question automatically (col. 9, lines 4-25).

48.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju for the same
reason set forth in claim 51 above.

49.   As per claim 55, Culliss teaches the invention substantially as claimed comprising:
        receiving a plurality of questions (col. 2, line 41);
        determining whether each of the plurality of questions has an answer located in a
        knowledge database (col. 5, lines 49-52; col. 9, lines 39-53), wherein a context-to-
        category map is used to determine whether the answer is stored in the knowledge
        database (col. 3, lines 30-35), wherein the knowledge based is search for an answer to
        each question based on a category for each question (col. 5, lines 49-52; col. 9, lines 39-
        53), wherein the context-to-category map is used to determine the category for each

question based on a context for the question (col. 3, lines 30-35), wherein the context

comprises one or more of:

a location within a particular website or particular information source, wherein the

location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the question when the

question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35); or

information about a system from which the question is submitted (col. 3, lines 30-35);

storing each of the plurality of questions in the knowledge database (col. 7, lines 15-46).

50.   Culliss does not teach unanswered questions. Suzuki teaches storing the question in the

knowledge database, wherein at least one of the plurality of questions is unanswered (col. 4, line

66-col. 5, line 13).

51.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss and Suzuki because Suzuki's teaching of

storing unanswered question would increase the efficiency of Culliss's system by providing the

answer for unanswered question to automatically accumulated in the database (col. 3, lines 6-9).

52.   Culliss and Suzuki do not teach one or more frequently asked unanswered question.

Machiraju teaches identifying one or more frequently asked unanswered questions (col. 7, lines

1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40); receiving another answer from an administrative source for each

of the one or more frequently asked unanswered questions (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11,

30-40).

53.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju because
Machiraju's teaching of identifying one or more unanswered question would provide ease of use
for a user in their systems by providing frequently asked questions linked with answers that are
related to the unanswered questions to the user (col. 3, lines 47-52).

54.   Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss in view of
Machiraju and further in view of Suzuki.

55.   As per claim 47, Culliss and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed as
claim 46 above. Culliss and Machiraju do not teach associate an answer with the unanswered
question. Suzuki teaches an authoring module configured to associate an answer with the
unanswered question (col. 9, lines 4-25).

56.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Machiraju and Suzuki because Suzuki's
teaching would increase the efficiency of their systems by providing the answer for unanswered
question to automatically accumulated in the database (col. 3, lines 6-9).

57.   Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss
in view of Machiraju and further in view of Warner et al, U.S. Patent 6,665,655 (hereinafter
Warner).

58.   As per claim 49, Culliss and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed as
claim 48 above. Culliss and Machiraju do not teach arranging the questions in order. Warner
teaches the statistics module arranges the question in a most frequently asked order (col. 7, line
15-col. 8, line 40; col. 9, lines 37-40).

59.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time o the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Machiraju and Warner because
Warner's teaching of arranging the questions in order would increase the user flexibility of their
systems by allowing the results to be presented according to the user.

60.   As per claim 50, Culliss and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as claimed as
claim 48 above. Culliss and Machiraju do not teach arranging the questions in order. Warner
teaches the statistics module arranges the question in a least frequently asked order (col. 7, line
15-col. 8, line 40; col. 9, lines 37-40).

61.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time o the
invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Machiraju and Warner because

Warner's teaching of arranging the questions in order would increase the user flexibility of their

systems by allowing the results to be presented according to the user.

62.   Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki

and Machiraju in view of Manduley et al, U.S. Patent 6,768,790 (hereinafter Manduley).

63.   As per claim 38, Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 36 above. Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju do not teach format comprises email

message. Manduley teaches determining the format comprises an e-mail message (col. 4, lines

7-41).

64.   It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time o the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Culliss, Suzuki, Machiraju and Manduley

because Manduley's teaching would increase the efficiency of their systems by allowing received

messages to be sorted according the message format.

65.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33-55, filed 06/15/09, have been fully

considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

66.   In the remark applicant argued that

                    (1)   Rejection of claims 45-52 under 35 USC 101 should be withdraw.

(2)   Culliss fails to teach identifying an operational context for a question, wherein the operational context comprises a location within the particular website or information source when the question is submitted, wherein the location is a currently or recently visited location by a submitter of the question.

(3)   The cited references fail to teach store tracking data for both normalized answered questions and normalized unanswered questions.

(4)   Warthen fails to teach results being selected based on both a category determined from a context of the question and based on frequency information for a plurality of questions.

(5)   None of the references teach wherein for each of a plurality of requests, based on a request type of the request, the program logic is configured to select one of the question module, the suggestion module, or the authoring module to handle the request.

(6)   None of the references teach wherein the context/category module, knowledge module, statistics module, and tracking modules are each used by one or more of the question module, the suggestion module, or the authoring module in handling the requests.

(7)   Warthen fails to teach identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with one or more of the plurality of categories associated with the context of the request for assistance.

(8)   None of the cited references teach frequently asked unanswered
question.

67.   In response to point (1), applicant's argument is moot in light of the rejection set forth
above.

68.   In response to point (2), Culliss teaches identifying operational context such as personal
activity data for the received question. Personal activity data includes previous or currently
website visit (col. 3, lines 30-35) (i.e., identify operational context which include a location of a
currently visited website).

69.   In response to point (3), the combination of Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju teach this
limitation. Specifically, store tracking data for the normalized unanswered question indicating
that the question was not answered (col. 7, lines 15-46) (i.e., storing portions of full queries that
contains personal data). Culliss does not teach unanswered question. Suzuki teaches if the
question is an unanswered question (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 13): store tracking data for the
unanswered question indicating that the question was not answered (col. 5, lines 6-11).
Machiraju teaches normalizing questions, wherein one or more superfluous word are removed
from the question (col. 5, lines 33-47).

70.   In response to point (4), applicant's argument for claim 45 is moot in view of new ground
of rejection.

71.   In response to points (5) and (6), applicant's arguments are moot in view of the citations

set forth in the rejection of claim 51 above.

72.   In response to point (7), the combination of Culliss and Warthen teach this limitation.

Although Culliss teaches identifying a plurality of questions associated with categories

associated with the context of the request (col. 9, lines 39-47), however, Culliss does not teach

identifying and displaying a plurality of most frequently asked questions. Warthen teaches a

similar invention comprising: identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions

associated with one or more of the plurality of categories (col. 3, lines 41-51; col. 6, lines 1-8).

73.   In response to point (8), Machiraju teaches identifying an unanswered question Machiraju

further teach identify an unanswered question (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40).

Machiraju further teach the unanswered question is included in the list of frequently asked

question (col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 2, lines 3-11, 30-40).

74.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action

is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply

is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is

not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this

communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee

whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO

5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by

telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on (571)

272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions

on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448